



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/900,312	07/06/2001	Harald Hess	VOI0131.CON	5684

7590

09/17/2002

Todd T. Taylor
Taylor & Aust, P.C.
142 S. Main St.
P.O. Box 560
Avilla, IN 46710

EXAMINER

FULLER, ERIC B

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

1762

DATE MAILED: 09/17/2002

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/900,312

Applicant(s)

HESS, HARALD

Examiner

Eric B Fuller

Art Unit

1762

— The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address —
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 02 July 2002.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-4, 8, 10 and 11 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-4, 8, 10 and 11 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. 09/301,194.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s) _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other:

DETAILED ACTION

Terminal Disclaimer

The terminal disclaimer filed on July 2, 2002 disclaiming the terminal portion of any patent granted on this application which would extend beyond the expiration date of US patent 6,248,407 has been reviewed and is accepted. The terminal disclaimer has been recorded.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-4, 8, 10 and 11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sundholm et al. (WO 94/11116) in view of Rosenberger et al. (US 5,993,913).

Sundholm teaches a process where a spray device, which has an application area, is oriented towards a fibrous web. The spray device atomizes the coating material and applies it to the web. A doctor blade is then used in order to sufficiently smooth the coating onto the web (page 6, line 17). Additionally, it is taught that the doctor blade leads to wasted coating material and that replacement of the doctor blade is time

consuming (page 1, lines 25-28). Although Sundolm teaches a method that reduces the amount of wasted coating material and reduces the frequency of doctor blade replacement, it does not teach a method that is sufficiently smooth enough to eliminate both. Thus, there is a desire to achieve smoother coatings in the art of spray coating fibrous webs.

Rosenberger teaches a method where a spray device, which has an application area, is oriented towards a substrate. The spray device atomizes a mixture of water (applicant's moistening medium) and coating medium (column 2, lines 52-63; column 5, lines 1-5). Measuring the humidity and adjusting the amount of water being mixed into the coating medium, prior to atomization, maintains the atmosphere around the nozzle. Rosenberger teaches that the water is added in order to reduce viscosity and increase flowability of the coating agent, which results in smoother surfaces (column 3, lines 41-45; table 1).

It would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to use the method taught by Rosenberger in order to coat the fibrous web of Sundolm. By doing so, the smoothness of the fibrous web would be increased.

As to the added limitations in claim 1, Rosenberger teaches that the spray booth may be semi-enclosed (column 3, lines 55-60), which reads on partially surrounding the spray device with a housing. From the figure, it can be seen that the vapor is supplied into the spray booth from the opposite direction of the spray and into the back of the spray device.

As to claims 2 and 3, according to Rosenberger, the moistening medium is in the form of a liquid when being mixed with the coating material. Since humidity is being measured and controlled in the atmosphere, it is inferred that the liquid, which is water, is being transformed into water vapor as it is passed through the nozzle (column 2, lines 19-31; column 3, lines 42-56).

As to claims 4 and 11, the water is being mixed upstream from the nozzles (figure). Therefore the spraying step utilizes the moistening medium.

As to claims 8 and 10, the spray device can be an electrostatic rotary atomizing device.

Claims 1-4, 8, 10, and 11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sundholm et al. (WO 94/11116) in view of Behmel et al. (US 4,396,651).

Sundholm teaches a process where a spray device, which has an application area, is oriented towards a fibrous web. The spray device atomizes the coating material and applies it to the web. A doctor blade is then used in order to sufficiently smooth the coating onto the web (page 6, line 17). Additionally, it is taught that the doctor blade leads to wasted coating material and that replacement of the doctor blade is time consuming (page 1, lines 25-28). Although Sundolm teaches a method that reduces the amount of wasted coating material and reduces the frequency of doctor blade replacement, it does not teach a method that is sufficiently smooth enough to eliminate

both. Thus, there is a desire to achieve smoother coatings in the art of spray coating fibrous webs.

Behmel teaches a process where a spray device, which has an application area, is oriented towards a substrate. The spray device atomizes the coating material in a main nozzle and atomizes an additive in an ancillary nozzle (abstract). The additive is water (inherently a moistening medium). The spray device causes mixing of the atomized water with the atomized coating material to create a heterogeneous mixture. The heterogeneous mixture allows for a high degree of wetting of the substrate, which provides for a smooth coating (column 3, lines 18-40; column 2, lines 1-29). The atmosphere is maintained by measuring the humidity and around the nozzle and adjusting the water flow rate (column 3, lines 8-15).

it would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to use the method taught by Behmel in order to coat the fibrous web of Sundolm. By doing so, the smoothness of the fibrous web would be increased.

As to the added limitations of claim 1, Behmel additionally teaches a spray room where humidity measurements are taken (column 3, lines 5-15). Although it is not taught whether this spray room completely houses the spray device or only partially surrounds it, it is the examiner's position that either option reads on partially surrounding (see arguments below). Therefore, by the use of a spray room, it is inherent that this room at least partially surrounds the spray device. The water is fed into the spray room

Art Unit: 1762

by ancillary nozzles that may be situated in a configuration that reads on the applicant's claims (column 2, lines 30-68; column 3, lines 1-7).

As to claims 2 and 3, according to Behmel, water, which is a liquid, is flowed into the ancillary nozzle. Since humidity is being measured and controlled in the atmosphere, it is inferred that the water is being transformed into water vapor as it is passed through the nozzle (column 3, lines 6-15).

As to claims 8 and 10, the spray device can be an electrostatic rotary atomizing device (column 2, line 45 and 61-66).

As to claim 11, as taught above, both the water and the coating medium are atomized prior to mixing. This reads on supplying the moistening medium to the atomized coating medium.

Response to Arguments

Applicant argues that none of the references cited teaches the limitation of "said housing partially surrounding said spray device". This argument is not found persuasive. Rosenberger explicitly teaches that the spray booth may be semi-enclosed (column 3, lines 55-60). This reads on partially surrounding the device. Additionally, Behmel teaches a spray booth. Since the claim *comprises* partially surrounding the spray device and does not teach to *only* partially surround it, it is the position of the examiner that a housing that completely surrounds a device would partially surround the device as well.

Conclusion

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Eric B Fuller whose telephone number is (703) 308-6544. The examiner can normally be reached on Tuesday through Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Shrive Beck can be reached on (703) 308-2333. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are 703 872-9310 for regular communications and (703) 872-9311 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-0661.

Application/Control Number: 09/900,312

Page 8

Art Unit: 1762



EBF

September 16, 2002



SHRIVE P. BECK
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 1700